

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/750,703	01/02/2004	Arjun Chandrasekar Iyer	SBL0011C1US	3820
60975 CAMPBELL S	7590 01/26/2009 STEPHENSON LLP	EXAMINER		
11401 CENTU	RY OAKS TERRACE	HARPER, LEON JONATHAN		
BLDG. H, SUI AUSTIN, TX			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			2166	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/26/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/750,703	CHANDRASEKAR IYER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Leon J. Harper	2166	

	Leon J. Harper	2166						
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address								
THE REPLY FILED 30 December 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.						
application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App	e reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this plication, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the plication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.314. The reply must be filed within one of the following time riods:							
	The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In							
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I	no event, however, will be statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fet have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fe under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the excitation date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) set forth in (b) above, if checked, Arm perby received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely file may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL. 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Sinc Notice of Appeal and seen filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).								
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co	The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
	(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal and the same of the same							
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.						
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1.	21 See attached Notice of Non Co.	maliant Amandment (OTOL 224)					
Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
	Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the							
 For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro- 		be entered and an e	planation of					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:								
Claim(s) objected to:								
Claim(s) rejected: <u>116-163</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:								
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 								
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appear y and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a					
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER								
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu <u>See continuation sheet.</u> 		condition for allowan	ce because:					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:								
/Hosain T Alam/								

continuation of #11 because applicants arguments are not persuaisve. In response to applicants argument that Because Pederson generates SQL queries that explicitly perform join operations and because the claimed method generates SQL statements that explicitly do not perform join operations, it cannot be said that Pederson teaches or suggests Claim 116.Block 24 also represents a dispatcher task executed by the lift node 12 sending the step messages to their assigned AMP nodes 12 via the interconnect network 14. Block 26 represents the AMP nodes 12 performing the required data manipulation associated with the step messages received from the IFP node 12, and then transmitting appropriate responses back over the interconnect network 14 to the IFP node 12. Block 28 represents the IFP node 12 to the users. Pederson, 4:25-57 (emphasis added). The above description refers to the flow chart of figure 2, showing steps in the interpretation and execution of SQL statements. See Pederson, 4:14-15. The bolded text in the above-cited passage refers to the splitting of the query detailed in block 24 of Figure 2, which is presented below. Examiner responds that Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in Claims-Proadest Reasonable interpretation. During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the reduction of some passage was the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51